

## Comments received by e-mail



Leon Brauning  
<leon.brauning@yahoo.com>

To howell\_chan@dot.ca.gov

cc

09/14/2007 02:25 PM

bcc

Subject Jameson Canyon Questions

History:

This message has been replied to and forwarded.

Dear Mr. Chan: I have only had a chance to read a portion of the EIR once, but wanted to get my two cents worth in before you close me out. Here are some questions for you about the Jameson Canyon:

LB1 1. The report says the eastern terminus of the project is Red Top Road. On Page 19 in the 2nd paragraph it says this is a "rational" end point. My questions are: Why is it rational when there is very limited access now to I-80? Where is all the backed up 2 lanes of east bound traffic supposed to go then? Isn't it true that you are not going to rebuild the access to allow all this traffic to get onto I-80 any faster than it does now?

LB2 2. The report says that the purpose of this project is to relieve traffic congestion. My question is: Silverado Trail is a 30 mile long county road that has had 14 deaths in the past 3 years while Jameson Canyon has had 1 death, why is not "Highway Safety" instead of traffic congestion a better use of the funds planned to be spent on Jameson Canyon?

LB3 4. Your report indicates as many as 4 federally and 17 state listed species of wild life are affected and woodlands, forest, wetlands and other waters are affected and many are significant effects. My question is: Exactly what are the mitigations you intend to do to reduce these effects to less than significant effects?

LB4 5. The traffic studies you cite are dated in 2003 and 2005. This is 2007 and the work won't even start for several years. My question is why are you using outdated traffic studies?

LB5 6. In Chapter 2 in the section regarding Consistency with Plans you mention nothing about the major loss at the polls in both Napa and Solano Counties in June 2006 of this project. You don't state that this has been turned down by Solano County Voters 4 times! You don't state that the Napa County voters said no! to this project. My question is why do you ignore the will of the people in this matter? My second question is why do you fail to state this information about the contrary elections in the EIR?

LB6 7. There is very confusing information in the media about the costs involved and who is paying what and how much. According to the media, Napa County is getting \$74 Million in Prop 1b bond money, but the amount coming from Napa and Solano counties is \$53 Million. My question is: How much of the \$74 million going to Napa County is to be used on Jameson Canyon, where is the remainder coming from or going to and who gets the use of the money and the income from it while it is waiting to be spent?

I will have many more questions, I am sure when given a chance to read and reread your documents/

Leon Brauning

Be a better Globetrotter. Get better travel answers from someone who knows.  
Yahoo! Answers - Check it out.



"ronanni"  
<ronanni@comcast.net>  
09/16/2007 11:25 AM

To <Howell\_Chan@dot.ca.gov>  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Widening of Jameson Canyon

History: This message has been forwarded.

A/RD1 So, a four lane parking lot is being planned? Interesting and wise. I commuted to and from Fairfield CA for a number of years. If Highway 80 and Highway 29 are not changed, our 4 lane parking lot will be a reality instead of someone's expensive useless dream.

A/RD2 What about buses? What about getting someone with ideas besides widening roads?

Anni and Ron Donahue  
Napa CA



Bob Hancock  
<bobhancock@mac.com>  
09/16/2007 07:04 PM

To <Howell\_Chan@dot.ca.gov>  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Comment on the IS-MND/EA for SR 12 widening/29  
Interchange---JUST DO IT! :)

History: This message has been forwarded.

My name is Robert Hancock. I am a resident of Angwin, CA (Napa County).

RH1 For the record, I am completely satisfied by the IS-MDN/EA study done regarding the SR 12 widening and its interchange with SR 29.

This project is LONG OVERDUE and I am delighted to see it progressing! As far as I'm concerned, it is not possible to get it done too soon.

Go! Go! GO!

Robert Hancock  
196 Brookside Dr. / P.O. Box 727  
Angwin, CA 94508





Johnithin@aol.com  
09/24/2007 10:30 PM

To Howell.Chan@dot.ca.gov  
cc cmalan@myoneearth.org  
bcc  
Subject State Route 12 Jameson Canyon Road Widening Initial  
Study Comments

History: This message has been forwarded.



Living Rivers Council  
1325 Imola Ave. PMB 614  
Napa, California, 94558  
(707) 255-7434  
(707) 259-1097 fax  
[www.livingriverscouncil.org](http://www.livingriverscouncil.org)

September 24, 2007

Caltrans, District Office 4  
Office of Environmental Analysis  
111 Grand Ave., 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612

Howell.Chan@dot.ca.gov

Re: Comments on Initial Study with Proposed Mitigate Negative Declaration (CEQA) and Environmental Assessment (NEPA), State Route 12 Jameson Canyon Road Widening & State Route 29/12 Interchange Project

1. Chapter 1.2 Background, 1.3 Project Purpose, Chapter 2.1.2 Growth, and 2.1.6 Traffic: "As more jobs have been established in Napa County and more residences built in Solano County, traffic volume congestion, and travel time have increased on this portion of SR 12." Comment A. Will the proposed road improvements to SR 12 encourage yet more commuting by people

LRC1

living in one county and working in another by making it more convenient for the commute on SR 12? Will then the expected increase of vehicles lead to a lower level of service? B. This project will be affected by the daily interstate interchange at Hwy 680/80 commute hour bottleneck. This is a segmented approach to traffic relief and the two projects should be developed together.

- LRC2
2. Chapter 1.4. Project Description, pg. 26, "Flyover": A. The text says local stakeholders found the flyover to be unacceptable. Who are these stakeholders who hold so much sway over Caltrans as to abandon the plan? Was cost the issue? None is given in the Initial Study. B. A Project Alternative should propose locating the road footprint outside the California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG) top of bank setbacks to Fagan Creek, Jameson Creek, or the CDFG jurisdiction of riparian vegetation. It is missing in the Initial Study. How many and types of wildlife will be killed by automobiles attempting to cross the new four lane roadway as compared to the existing two lane road since there are no barriers or directional devices to control wildlife crossings?
- LRC3
3. 2.2.5 Air Quality: How much carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, and particulate matter will from idling vehicles will be produced caused by the interstate 680/80 interchange commute hour bottleneck after the project is completed? How will this project effect global warming? Won't this project still result in a wider Jameson Canyon commute hour parking lot traffic jam and damage air quality?
- LRC4
4. 2.3 Biological: A. Will the removal of trees effect the water temperature of adjacent creeks? B. How much will the erection of reflective and heat generating south facing concrete road retaining walls cause creek water temperatures to rise? C. The International Panel on Climate Change (2007) recommended against any further loss of forest land to combat global warming. How much cumulative impact will this project's cutting of tree affect global warming? D. How much carbon sequestering ability will be lost from the cutting of mature trees and replacing them with seedling trees? E. How many years will it take to reach pre-project levels of carbon sequestering from the loss of mature trees?
- LRC5
5. 2.3 Biological: Loss of riparian habitat is not discussed.
- LRC6
6. 2.3. Biological, pg. 146: CDFG jurisdiction extends to the "outer edge of riparian vegetation." The roadway footprint proposes to maintain the harmful intrusion into the riparian vegetation. It should be relocated outside of the CDFG riparian vegetative setbacks.
- LRC7
7. 2.3. Biological: What efforts will be made to replant the barren Fagan Creek and Jameson Creeks?
- LRC8
8. 2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species, pg 175: Protocol level surveys to determine Branchiopod Species in wetlands were conducted in July 2007 when many wetlands were dry. Also 2006- 2007 was an inordinately dry year with a below normal rainfall. A new survey should be conducted during a normal rain year and in the early spring months for Branchiopod Species.
- LRC9
9. 2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species, pg 177-180: A. The survey for the presence of California Red Legged Frogs (CRLF) was conducted in 2007, an extraordinarily dry year. A new survey should be conducted in a normal rainfall year and at the appropriate time of year to accurately verify the presence or non presence of the CRLF. B. How many frogs will be killed by the expanded, four lane SR 12 as compared to the existing two lane road? C. If culverts are used to provide for passage for CRLF and other animals how will the wildlife be directed to culverts and not on to the highway? D. Are causeway designs with the roadway elevated and out of reach more effective for wildlife passage than culverts? E. Highways typically reduce local wildlife populations. How will SR 29 and 12 approach and interchange prevent the known local population of CRLF from attempting to traverse the roadway and to safe passage ways?
- LRC10
10. 2.5 Climate Change: How much carbon monoxide and other green house gasses will be released into the atmosphere due to idling vehicles on SR 12 due to the rush hour backup at the 680/80 interchange?



- LRC11
11. This project requires an EIR due to significant cumulative impacts in the region to CRLF. This project will cause significant environmental impact an endangered specie, the CRLF, thereby requiring an EIR.
- LRC12
12. The Napa County Industrial Park/Airport Specific Plan depends on the Jamison Canyon improvement in order to expand the Industrial Park. Hence, that makes the Jamison Canyon Widening/Interchange growth inducing, a significant environmental impact thereby requiring an EIR.
- LRC13
13. We the public, want to make comments on the NEPA document How do we do this? Who is the lead on the NEPA document? Isn't NEPA required due to this being a federally funded project? Won't NEPA be required to consider impacts to CRLF? Please send Living Rivers Council all NEPA documentation and comments by responsible agencies such as USFWS.

Sincerely,

Chris Malan  
John Stephens

---

See what's new at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com) and [Make AOL Your Homepage](#).





GGBGinny@aol.com  
09/24/2007 11:45 AM

To Howell\_Chan@dot.ca.gov  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Jamieson Canyon Study

History: This message has been forwarded.

January 23, 2007

Caltrans Office of Environmental Analysis  
P. O. Box 23660 Mail Station 6-C  
Oakland, CA 94623-0660  
Attn: Howard Chan

Re: Initial Study Jamieson Canyon Widening & Hwy12/29 Interchange Project

Dear Mr. Chan;

Thank you for arranging a meeting in Napa to discuss this plan, and for accepting our comments.

GS1 First, I want to endorse the comments of Eve Kahn. The impacts on growth are minimized, especially the negative jobs/housing result in Solano County, and will result in even poorer air quality in the North Bay. I also endorse her other comments.

GS2 The proposed Negative Declaration of the project is thorough in many of the parts that evaluate the widening of the highway to four lanes divided.

However, it is deficient in the area of what kind of safe crossing of the new highway is being provided for cyclists and pedestrians. Since the path will have to use Red Top Road to continue eastward over Hwy 80, a safe crossing of Hwy12 will be needed. An addendum to the Study should be included, so that the possibilities are evaluated, and maximum safety is assured.

GS3 This Study proposes to include a Negative Declaration for the intersection SRS12/29. This is a separate large project, which contains no final or complete information on either design or funding timing. It should not be given a Negative Declaration at this time. **It is so incomplete that it will preclude informed decisionmaking and informed public participation, thereby thwarting the statutory goals of the EIR process.**

GS4 First, it does not provide any meaningful data on traffic relief, since the traffic counts are old and do not show the AM Peak figures. For this intersection, no informed decision can be made without recent (within three years) data about the northbound backup, for example, how many signal changes that traffic must wait. The PM Peak numbers are not sufficient.

GS5 The decision to use an expensive unfunded solution at this intersection is not supported. A

flyover has been rejected, based on eight year old data. Such data is seriously outdated, and only a new AM Peak data collection justifies eliminating this as an alternative. The present Study states that eliminating that was a local preference, articulated without a cost or timing comparison or current traffic data. This is an example of **insufficient data for informed decisionmaking**.

GS6

The Study declares a negative impact of a separate large interchange project which will likely not be built for many years. The actual impact of this interchange should be examined when the likelihood of construction is nearer. An example of the value of deferring the Study is that the traffic northbound at the intersection could be greatly altered with the completion of Devlin Road between American Canyon and the airport. That project is expected soon.

GS7

**An informed public cannot comment on the validity** of the intersection project based on the information in this Study. I urge the removal of the portions of the Study concerning the intersection of SR12/29.

Ginny Simms  
21 Oak Grove Way  
Napa, CA 94559

Cc: Napa County Planning Dept

See what's new at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com) and [Make AOL Your Homepage](#).



Kathy smith  
<castlekathy1070@yahoo.com>

11/16/2007 01:30 PM


To howell.chan@dot.ca.gov

cc

bcc

Subject 2912 corner intersection

History:

 This message has been replied to.

I am the owner of the corner of 1 Executive Way, formally the Sake plant. I currently have invested not only the \$8 million purchase price, but another \$10 million in the re construction and equipment of the production building. Our plans for the property is running a brewrey and winery.

KS1 The corner also allow a tasing room with food pairing. One of the main concerns will be the visability of the property to allow access for vistors to the tasting room. Our plans include expanding the brewrey to have outside tanks in the far corner part of the proerty, closest to the intersection of 2912. Reducing the property lines, and with setback laws, this would not be possible for our expansion. For us to recapture our investment in this property, we need to utilize the whole property. With the setback requirements, taking any part of the land would greatly effect the plans for recapture and growth.

I herby request that the opposite side of the freeway be used, currently vacant land at this time. Please contact me to meet with you at any time regarding this State/County proposal to meet everyone needs.

thank you  
Kathleen Smith  
Napa Smith Brewrey  
1 Executive Way  
Napa. CA

Cell (650) 922-0485

Never miss a thing. [Make Yahoo your homepage.](#)